

MINUTES OF THE  
MARICOPA ASSOCIATION OF GOVERNMENTS  
REGIONAL BICYCLE TASK FORCE AND  
PEDESTRIAN WORKING GROUP

Tuesday, April 18, 2000  
MAG Office Building, Suite 200 - Saguaro Room  
302 North First Avenue, Phoenix

MEMBERS ATTENDING

Patrick McDermott, Chandler, Chair,  
Regional Bicycle Task Force  
Cynthia Seelhammer, Queen Creek, Chair,  
Pedestrian Working Group  
Michael Eagan, American Society of Landscape  
Architects  
Bruce Meyers, Arizona Department of  
Administration  
\*Mark Mansfield, ADOT  
\*Mickey Ohland, Chandler  
\*Tami Ryall, Gilbert  
Debbie Burdette, Glendale  
Janeen K. Holomon for Larry Martinez,  
Goodyear

Mike Cartsonis, Litchfield Park  
Reed Kempton, Maricopa County  
Steve Hancock, Mesa  
\*Chris Jacques, Peoria  
\*Lorry Kuiper, Phoenix Planning Department  
Mark Melnychenko, Phoenix Transit  
Kristina Fields, Phoenix  
Maureen Mageau-DeCindis, RPTA  
Amy MacAulay, Scottsdale  
\*Jorie Bresnahan, Scottsdale  
Eric Iwersen, Tempe

\*Members neither present nor represented by proxy.

OTHERS PRESENT

Carmen Bledsoe, RBF  
Dawn Coomer, MAG  
Tom Fitzgerald, Phoenix

Michelle Green, RBF  
Mike Normand, Chandler  
J.D. Trebec, Maricopa County Planning

1. Call to Order

Chair Cynthia Seelhammer called the meeting to order at 1:45 p.m.

2. Approval of the March 21, 2000 Meeting Minutes of the Regional Bicycle Task Force and Pedestrian Working Group

Eric Iwersen moved to approved the meeting minutes of March 21, 2000. Maureen Mageau-DeCindis seconded the motion, and the motion passed unanimously.

### 3. Call to the Audience

No member of the audience wished to address the Working Group and Task Force.

### 4. Staff Report

Dawn Coomer provided a status report of current transportation items. She reminded members about the Pedestrian Conference on April 25 and 26, and encouraged all to attend. Nearly 80 are registered and there is room for a total of 100. In addition, many members had received phone calls asking if there were projects that could be advanced, including advance design of already programmed projects, during the FY 2000 closeout of federal funds. No members had questions or comments about this process. Dawn add that the Transportation Enhancement Fund application would be revised this year, and that she would have a copy on April 28<sup>th</sup>. Mark Melnychenko suggested that no boxes be used on the application. Other members suggested reducing the number of questions and eliminating redundant questions.

### 5. Member Agency Report

Committee members were invited to provide an update of bicycle planning activity in their agencies. Kristina Fields noted that Phoenix would be creating the Phoenix Sonoran Bikeway. Much of the bikeway already exists as striped bike lanes and canals. The 39-mile Bikeway needs to be signed, and some historic interpretation may be added as well.

Maureen Mageau-DeCindis provided an update of the bicycle rack program. She noted that each rack holds 24 bikes and two more are available for use in high schools. She requested that those interested call her to discuss any additional questions.

Mark Melnychenko distributed a draft working paper of Pedestrian Oriented Guidelines. Comments on the draft should be directed to Mark McLaren, consultant to Valley Metro. On May 6, there will be an additional workshop in South Phoenix to discuss the guidelines. The first workshop, held in Tempe, was very successful. The goal is to link land use and transportation and create a model regional ordinance. In addition, Phoenix may create a transit overlay district which would incorporate the guidelines.

Eric Iwersen asked if public comment was still being accepted on the draft, and Mark responded affirmatively. Eric mentioned that a presentation to the Tempe Bicycle Advisory Committee would be helpful. Mike Cartsonsis asked if these guidelines would be included in the bicycle plan, and the committee discussed this issue. Eric suggested that a reference be made to the document in the ROSS plan.

Amy MacAulay noted that Scottsdale had a public celebration of a new pathway segment along Pima. The pathway is approximately 4 miles in length. She added that Scottsdale also sponsored an event for Valley Bike Week.

Reed Kempton mentioned that he would be teaching about bicycle planning to a transportation planning class at ASU.

## 6. Regional Off-Street System (ROSS) Plan

Two items were enclosed with the agenda: the public involvement plan and the revised vision statement, goals and objectives. The public involvement plan is already being implemented. The draft evaluation criteria was faxed to the committee prior to the meeting.

No members of the committee had any comments on the public involvement plan. The committee did have some comments for the vision statement, goals and objectives. Kristina Fields noted that the paved pathway through the Phoenix Mountain Preserve is an existing pathway and is used by commuters. This path needs to be included in the plan.

Mike Cartsonis noted that neighborhood planning and the concept of linking residents to community destinations needed to be mentioned, along with appropriate land use to encourage bicycling and walking. Amy MacAulay responded that the plan is regional in scope. Pat McDermott added that this plan will complement the existing on-street bicycle plan. Maureen Mageau-DeCindis said that the accessibility goal and the implementation goal addresses these concepts adequately. She added that some statements were vague and were unclear. The objectives should be clarified and identifying ways to cross arterials should be mentioned more prominently.

Eric Iwersen added that the ROSS should reference the Arterial Crossing Report done for the MAG Pedestrian Design Assistance Program. Mark Melnychenko added that access to transit was important. Maureen added that giving examples may clarify some of the objectives. Eric said that the phrase “crossing and connecting arterials” should be mentioned under the connections objective. Pat encouraged other members to submit changes to the goals and objectives directly to MAG staff so that other issues could also be discussed at today’s meeting.

Steve Hancock added a final comment that the “safety” goal should not be overemphasized which may possibly communicate that bicycling and walking are unsafe activities. He suggested using words like “comfort level” or “access.” The committee discussed this, agreeing that the plan should not insinuate that off-street facilities are safer than on-street facilities. Clearly, both elements are important to include in a regional bicycle plan.

Michelle Green distributed a revised corridor map to the committees. The map was discussed. Cynthia Seelhammer suggested that the washes be shown more clearly on the map — they are not visible on the current map. Michelle noted that some utility information was not yet on the map. Steve mentioned that the ownership of the corridors is vital to know since not all agencies are equally supportive of developing off-street corridors into travel ways for bicyclists and pedestrians. Not all transmission line easements are owned by SRP. Michelle responded that her contacts at SRP would be reviewing the draft corridor map for accuracy. Eric said that rail lines need to be distinguished between inactive and active since inactive lines have greater potential to use as non-motorized corridors.

Next, draft evaluation criteria was distributed to the committee. The criteria will be used to create a hierarchical system of off-street paths. The committee once again emphasized that the criteria should not limit the funding of locally established priorities. Eric suggested that perhaps two plans could be developed: a long range plan and a short range implementation plan.

The committee agreed that definitions for A, B and C segments need to be created. Mike Normand said that some criteria seemed to be related to goals and objectives, while others are related to implementation. He recommended separating the criteria into these two categories. Debbie Burdette suggested not using "A," "B," and "C," since these terms indicate priorities. Amy noted that several of these questions are very difficult to answer, such as "fills a gap" and "sufficient right-of-way."

The committee discussed at length how to use the evaluation criteria. Reed Kempton suggested providing the evaluation criteria, but not categorizing the different potential corridors. The evaluation criteria could simply be presented in the plan for others to apply as appropriate. The committee discussed this idea, with no resolution of the issue. Staff agreed to put this item on next month's agenda for additional discussion.

The committee was then asked to identify potential model projects to address design issues. Thus far, only Tempe has identified a project. Projects should be located along corridors identified in the plan and should have some design problems. The solutions developed can be applied to similar corridors throughout the off-street system. Cynthia noted that Queen Creek has a flood control channel which might make a good project, which connects the high school to the old Williams Air Force Base.

## 7. Next Meeting

The Pedestrian Working Group and Regional Bicycle Task Force will be meeting on May 16, 2000 from 1:30 to 3:00 p.m. A Regional Trails Forum will follow from 4:00 p.m. to 6:00 p.m.